

THE CRISIS.

Devoted to the Support of the Democratic Principles of Jefferson.

"Union, harmony, self-denial, concession—everything for the Cause, nothing for Men."

NO. 17.

RICHMOND, SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 1840.

VOL. I.

TERMS.

The Crisis will be printed in quarto form, on a medium sheet, with new type. The price \$1.—no paper will be sent to any person, without payment in advance, postage paid. As nothing short of a very large and effective subscription can justify the continuation of the paper, the above terms will be strictly adhered to. "We mean to make no debt at all." We abjure all credit in this establishment, and insist upon the Cash System.

POLITICS.

(From the Petersburg American Statesman.)

GENERAL HARRISON.

TARIFF—PUBLIC DEBT—INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.

WASHINGTON CITY, June 10, 1840.

To Dr. B. H. May, Chairman of the Corresponding Committee appointed by the Democratic Vigilance Committee of Petersburg, Virginia.

Dear Sir—General William Henry Harrison, the nominee of the Harrisburg Convention for the Presidency, served in the Senate of Ohio, during its session, commencing on 6th day of December, 1819, and terminating on 26th day of February, 1820. We have examined the journal of that session, and transmit for your information some extracts therefrom. These extracts from the journal of the Senate of Ohio, taken in connexion with the course of the General in Congress, will enable you, without doubt or difficulty, to form a correct opinion of his views relative to the power and duty of the Federal Government to enact a system of protection for domestic manufacture, and to adopt and execute a general plan of Internal Improvements.

You will observe that the second resolution as adopted in the Senate on the 14th December, 1819, declares, "That in the present state of pecuniary embarrassment amongst the people, it is unwise and impolitic for the Government to pay off the public debt more rapidly than the obligations it may have come under to its creditors may require, and that any surplus in the Treasury would be more usefully employed in the internal improvement of the country, by roads and canals, and in the support and encouragement of domestic manufactures."

It is true, that this resolution underwent a modification before its final adoption by the concurrence of both Houses. Gen. Harrison voted for it in the form above quoted, and it is sufficient, therefore, to prove, that he maintained that in 1819, with a national debt of more than ninety millions bearing a heavy interest, "any surplus in the Treasury would be more usefully employed in the internal improvement of the country, by roads and canals, and in the support and encouragement of domestic manufactures. Farmers and planters are to be subjected to the payment of most onerous duties on the foreign goods which they consume, and then are to be deprived of that consolation which would be afforded by the application of the proceeds of such exactions to the payment of a national debt incurred for the general defense. Under General Harrison's system, our money is to be lavished not only in profligate and unconstitutional expenditures, upon works of internal improvement, but is to be gratuitously bestowed for the direct support and encouragement of domestic manufactures. The avail of the honest industry of the cultivators of the soil would be, under such a system, extracted from their pockets and transferred, without consent or equivalent, to the proprietors of manufacturing establishments. Such action, although cloaked under the forms of legislative enactments, is essentially, in principle, unmixed despotism and dishonest plunder.

We furnish you all we can find in the journal of the Senate, relating to the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of Ohio, at the instance of Gen. Harrison. We have not wilfully suppressed any thing—we have not knowingly omitted any thing. You will trace these resolutions from their incipiency, through their progress to their final adoption. You will place your own construction on them—you will draw your own conclusions as to the odious principles of Federal administration which they embody.

Extracts from the journal of the Senate of Ohio, for the session beginning on 6th of December, 1819, and ending on the 26th of Feb., 1820:

December 9th, 1819.—Page 70.

Mr. Harrison moved the adoption of two resolutions instructing our members in Congress to procure the passage of laws modifying the Tariff on imported articles, and for the encouragement of domestic manufac-

tures, and Internal Improvements, which were read and ordered to lie on the table.

Ordered, that one hundred copies of said resolutions be printed for the use of the members of the Legislature.

December 11th, 1819.—Page 81.

"The Senate then took up the resolutions offered by Mr. Harrison, and which were ordered to lie on the table, on the subject of the tariff on imported articles, and for the encouragement of domestic manufactures and internal improvement of the country by roads and canals; and,

"On motion, The said resolutions were committed to a Committee of the whole Senate and made the order of the day for Monday next."

December 13th, 1819.—Page 82.

"The Senate then, according to order, resolved itself into a committee of the whole upon the resolutions respecting the tariff on imported articles, internal improvements and domestic manufactures, and after some time spent therein, the Speaker resumed the chair, and Mr. Brown reported that the committee, according to order, had said several resolutions under consideration, and had made some amendments thereto, which he presented at the Clerk's table."

December 14th, 1819—pages 83 and 84.

"The Senate then took up the report of the committee of the whole upon the resolutions respecting the tariff on imported articles, and relative to internal improvements and domestic manufactures, which report was amended and agreed to, and on motion to agree to the following resolution, to wit:

Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That, in their opinion, the present pecuniary embarrassments of the country are, in a great degree, caused by want of encouragement and protection to domestic manufactures; and that good policy requires that such modifications of the tariff on imported articles be immediately made, as will stop the importation of foreign merchandise which has destroyed or undermined the operations of the greater part of the manufacturing establishments of the United States.

Which motion to agree to said resolution was unanimously decided in the affirmative.

The yeas and nays having been required, those members who were present and voted in the affirmative were:

Messrs. Baldwin, Brown, Campbell, Fithian, Foos, Furnas, Harrison, Hooker, Irwin, Jennings, Lucas, Madeara, McLaughlin, McLean, Newcom, Pollock, Robb, Ruggles, Russel, Shelby, Simpson, Spencer, Swearingen, Sullivan, Thompson, and Trimble, Speaker.

On motion, to agree to the resolution relative to Internal Improvements and domestic manufactures, to wit:

Resolved, That in the present state of pecuniary embarrassment amongst the people, it is unwise and impolitic for the Government to pay off the public debt more rapidly than the obligations it may have come under to its creditors may require, and that any surplus in the Treasury would be more usefully employed in the internal improvement of the country by roads and canals, and in the support and encouragement of domestic manufactures.

Which motion to agree was decided in the affirmative—yeas 24, Nays 2.

And the yeas and nays being required, those who voted in the affirmative were,

Messrs. Baldwin, Brown, Campbell, Fithian, Foos, Furnas, Harrison, Hooker, Irwin, Jennings, Lucas, Madeara, McLaughlin, McLean, Newcom, Pollock, Robb, Ruggles, Simpson, Spencer, Swearingen, Sullivan, Thompson, and Speaker (Trimble.)

Those who voted in the negative were,

Messrs. Russel and Shelby.

The Senate then came to the following resolution, on motion of Mr. Harrison :

Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested to use their exertions to procure the passage of laws, embracing the principles recommended in the foregoing resolutions.

December 17th, 1819.—Pages 93 and 94.

"A message from the House of Representatives.

"They have agreed to the resolution of the Senate relative to the tariff on imported articles, and relative to domestic manufactures and internal improvements, with amendments, in which they desire the concurrence of the Senate.

The Senate then took up said amendments and agreed to the 1st, 3d and 4th amendments of the House of Representatives to said resolutions, and disagreed to their 2nd amendment to said resolutions.

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be informed thereof.

December 20th, 1819.—Page 96.

"A message from the House of Representatives.

"They insist on their 2nd amendment to the resolution relative to the tariff on imported articles, and relative to domestic manufactures and internal improvements."

December 21st, 1819.—Pages 99 and 100.

"The Senate then took up the message from the House of Representatives, informing the Senate that the House insisted on their 2nd amendment to the resolution of the Senate relative to the tariff on imported articles, and relative to domestic manufactures and internal improvements.

On motion, Ordered, That the Senate insist on their disagreement to the said amendment; and that a conference be requested on the subject matter of difference between the two Houses, relative to said resolutions.

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be informed thereof.

Page 101.

"A message from the House of Representatives.

The House have agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the subject of difference pending between the two Houses, relative to the 2nd amendment of the House to the resolution relative to the Tariff on imported articles, &c., and have appointed conferees on their part."

December 23d, 1819.—Page 107.

"Mr. Harrison from the committee, made the following report:

"The committee of conference to whom was referred the subject matter of difference between the two Houses, on the resolution respecting the Tariff on imported articles, and giving encouragement to American manufacturers, have agreed that the following be substituted for the 2nd resolution in lieu of the one which was disagreed to by the House of Representatives, viz:

"Resolved, That in the present state of pecuniary embarrassment amongst the people, any appropriation of money or lands which Congress may think proper to make for the improvement of the country by the construction of roads and canals, and for the encouragement of American manufactures would have a great tendency to remove that embarrassment, and promote the general welfare of the nation." Which report was taken up and agreed to.

Ordered, That the same be sent to the House of Representatives for their concurrence.

December 24th, 1819.—Page 108.

"A message from the House of Representatives.

"The House of Representatives have agreed to the report of the committee of conference, on the subject matter of difference pending between the two Houses, relative to the 2nd amendment of the House to the resolution relative to the tariff on imported articles, and relative to domestic manufactures and internal improvements."

We furnish you also a statement of the national debt, as estimated on 1st October 1819.

Estimate of the funded debt of the United States, first October, 1819.

Deferred six per cent. stock, (unredeemed amount)	\$2,805,020 57
Three per cent.	13,295,915 44
Louisiana, six per cent.	4,818,279 92
Six per cent. 1796	80,000 00
Exchanged, six per cent. 1812	2,668,974 99
Six per cent. stock of 1812, (loan of 11 millions)	6,187,006 84
Six per cent. stock of 1813, (loan of 16 millions)	15,521,136 45
Six per cent. stock of 1813, (loan of 7½ millions)	6,836,232 39
Six per cent. stock of 1814, (loan of 25 and 3 millions)	13,011,437 63
Six per cent. stock of 1815, (loan of \$18,468,800)	9,490,099 10
Treasury note, six per cent. stock	1,419,185 61
Treasury note, seven per cent. stock	8,505,306 27
Five per cent. stock, (subscription to Bank of the U. S.)	7,000,000 00
Amount, 1st Oct., 1819,	\$91,738,587 51

Is a national debt a national blessing? Is it wise or economical to expend a surplus in unproductive works, rather than appropriate it to the payment of just debts, and to the consequent prevention of an accretion of interest? You, sir, will be naturally led to compare the doctrines of General Harrison, developed in his resolution and the practical results which would necessarily flow from them, with the doctrines avowed and enforced by Andrew Jackson, and the propitious results of the measures of his administration, in reference to the extinguishment of the nation's debt. In connection with the sentiments of General Harrison, avowed in 1819, you will bring to your recollection the occasional discussions, during General Jackson's administration, touching the speedy payment of our debt, and the resistance which his favorite policy encountered from the Opposition. The original opponents of his administration constitute the main body of the opposition to Mr. Van Buren, and the principal and largest ingredient of the party sustaining Gen. Harrison. I think with you, sir, if such a party had continued in power, with such latitudinous opinions of the powers of the Federal Government, and with the avowals, that it was unwise and impolitic to rid ourselves of debt and accruing interest more rapidly than the positive obligations of public faith to the creditor demanded,—that we should not yet feel a large remnant of debt pressing against the resources of the country, and presenting obstacles to the reduction of our burdens to the smallest amount adequate to a wise and frugal administration. Under their political guidance, is it probable that we should have enjoyed the unbounded gratification of beholding the unexampled spectacle of a great and powerful nation entirely free from debt?

Would their principles and their policy have yet afforded the occasion for that most interesting Republican Jubilee held by the faithful Representatives of a free and mighty People in commemoration of their pecuniary disenchantment?

Pardon us, sir, for briefly adverting to the extraordinary doctrines contained in Gen. Harrison's Resolutions in the form in which they received the final assent of both branches of the General Assembly of Ohio. The embarrassments of that period (1819) are asserted to be caused, in a great degree, "by want of encouragement and protection to domestic manufactures."—It may have been so notwithstanding the want of ability to comprehend it. How exemption from taxation—how diminished burdens upon the productions and industry of a country can produce increased embarrassment, we cannot perceive; and we have no recollection of having seen such a doctrine maintained and illustrated in any standard work upon political economy. How an imposition of burdens on the People, in order to acquire means of affording encouragement and protection to a few favored classes of industry, can relieve the general pecuniary embarrassments of a country, is, we candidly confess, beyond our comprehension. But such is the panacea proposed in the Resolution. Such is the medicine, which Doctor Harrison, as he has been styled in debate, would administer to heal that national disease called "pecuniary distress and embarrassment." But he proposes, as required by good policy, such modifications of the Tariff as will stop that inundation of foreign merchandise which has destroyed or suspended the operations of the greater part of the manufacturing establishments of the U. S. Here the power is virtually asserted of shackling our commerce on the high seas, of imposing exorbitant burdens upon the importation of goods from abroad, operating to the great diminution, yea, even to the prohibition of our trade with foreign nations; and not for the avowed purpose, or even under the usual flimsy pretext, of providing for the common defence, or promoting the general welfare, but for the partial and isolated purpose of sustaining, protecting and encouraging that portion of capital and labor employed in domestic manufactures. The resolution too would seem to embrace the claim of a right to pass judgment upon the amount of importation which may be prudently made, and to interpose to prevent extravagance and excess.

The principles which would authorize the Federal Government, under the semblance of parental guardianship, to restrain the imprudent and excessive importations of foreign merchandise, would equally justify its impudent scrutiny and interference in all the relations of life. Under its sanction, laws might be enacted to restrain the citizens from wasteful extravagance, from imprudent expenditures, and from speculation and overtrading—even sumptuary regulations might find protection under its broad mantle—that, thereby pecuniary embarrassment, and the derangement of the business of the country might be prevented. No matter in what lofty expressions of patriotism—no matter in what honeyed phrase of maternal kindness such a principle may lurk, it must essentially, in its practical operation, assimilate to eastern despotism. Its ultimate tendency is the subjection of the wealth, the capital, the industry, the labor, the enterprise of the whole

country to the rapacious and withering grasp of arbitrary power.

The second resolution as re-constructed in the Committee of Conference, and received and agreed to by both Houses, affirms distinctly the power of Congress, at discretion, to appropriate money or lands for the improvement of the country by the construction of roads and canals, and for the encouragement of American manufactures. And it holds the doctrine, that in a state of pecuniary embarrassment among the people, the appropriation of money or lands to such purposes would have a great tendency to remove that embarrassment, and promote the general welfare of the nation. We will not here renew the criticism upon this extraordinary mode of relief. Did not Alexander Hamilton, in one of his reports, claim the broad power of raising revenue to any amount, and the right of Congress to appropriate it to the cause of literature, agriculture, internal improvement, manufactures, &c. Whilst the doctrine of the unlimited power of Congress to raise revenue, and of unlimited discretion, as to objects and amount, in its appropriation, was zealously maintained by the old Federal party, it was warmly and indignantly repudiated by the Republican party. In fact the extent and limits of the power to raise and appropriate revenue, constituted, in a great degree, the questions of differing constructions between the parties. The power to raise and appropriate revenue, with no other limit but the discretion of Congress is derived from that liberal and latitudinous construction of the Constitution which characterized the political creed of Hamilton and Marshall, and the mass of their disciples. The contrary doctrine was espoused by Jefferson, Madison, John Taylor and their disciples. The Republicans did not admit that Congress might make any appropriation of money which it might think proper; and they maintained and demonstrated that the Federal doctrine tended to substitute the discretion of Congress for the limitations of the Constitution, and thereby gradually to convert the government into one of unlimited powers. Gen. Harrison holds, according to his resolution, that any appropriation of money may be made, which Congress may think proper to make, for the improvement of the country by the construction of roads and canals, and for the encouragement of American manufactures. And it will surely be questioned, that the rule of construction which authorizes unlimited appropriations of money for objects of internal improvement, and for the protection and encouragement of manufactures, will, by parity of reason and argument, also authorize appropriations of money for the protection of agriculture, and for the promotion of all other objects which Congress may select—in fine, for any thing which may be deemed by Congress in its unlimited discretion, conducive to "the general welfare of the nation."

But the resolution includes the public lands also in this sweeping claim to discretionary appropriations.—Can it be intended by an appropriation of lands for the encouragement of manufactures, to introduce the system of bestowing land bounties upon manufacturing companies? Is a part of the public domain, instead of being sold at a moderate price to actual settlers, to be given gratuitously to rich companies of manufacturers? Is the already powerful influences of these associations of wealth, upon the population of their vicinities, and upon the legislation of the country, to be still more largely and alarmingly extended by the acquisition of vast tracts of territory? Are the manufacturing establishments of the country to become, by the bounty of Congress, extensive proprietors of the rich soil of the West, and be converted into non-resident landlords?

The resolution must contemplate a specific appropriation of land, because it so expressly declares, and because the proceeds of sale, if so intended, would have been so expressed, and because the term *money* would also include them.

The proposal to appropriate lands to the construction of roads and canals, is not confined, in the resolution, to improvements through the public lands, or even to the State or Territory in which they are situated. The proposition is as broad as the United States and all their Territories, and as indefinite as the roads and canals which past time has accomplished, present time is completing, and future time may bring into existence, "for the improvement of the country." Upon the admission of new States into the Union, it is usual to grant them a portion of the public lands, for the purposes of internal improvement and education, by express compact, and in consideration of their forbearance to tax the residue. Sometimes sections of land are granted in the States or Territories to aid in the prosecution of improvements passing through those lands, as compensation for the enhanced value thus bestowed on them. Whether these specific cases be defensible upon constitutional principles, or founded in wise policy, or not, they have ever been regarded as separate and distinct, not embraced in the great question of the power of Congress to carry on a general system of internal improvement throughout the U. States, and not constituting precedents for the settlement of that question or for the exercise of that power. The resolution contains no limitation or restriction to the spe-

cial cases cited, but it covers the whole country, and embraces all the roads and canals designed for its improvement.

What then, briefly, are the doctrines of Gen. Harrison as developed in the resolutions which have been the subject of comment?

Congress may regulate the tariff of duties on foreign merchandise, not for revenue only, but for prevention or prohibition of importation, and for the purpose of protecting domestic manufactures.

Congress may not only protect manufactures by duties on foreign goods, but may make direct appropriations of money and lands for their encouragement.

A double protection is thus afforded, first, by the imposition of duties, and second, by the direct bounty of lands and money.

Congress may appropriate any amount of money or lands, it thinks proper for the improvement of the country by the construction of roads and canals. The compromise is on the eve of expiration. The questions of the Tariff and Internal Improvement are again to be discussed. The issue of the pending presidential election will exert, in all probability great influence upon their adjustment. Can any state south of Mason and Dixon's line, support Gen. Harrison with the doctrines contained in his Ohio resolutions unrecanted, without a total abandonment of all their long-cherished principles upon the subjects of the Tariff and Internal Improvement? Will any Southern State aid in reviving and fastening upon us a system of policy, which will not be abandoned until Charleston and Norfolk become green with grass, and the authors of the system be convinced that it is the cause of such verdant desolation?

We are very respectfully, sir,
Your friends and fellow-citizens,
FRANCIS E. RIVES,
GEORGE C. DROMGOOLE

General Harrison's views of the Tariff, Internal Improvement and Public Debt.

We invite particular attention to the communication from Messrs. Rives and Dromgoole, found in another column. From the extracts taken by them from the Journal of the Ohio Senate, we see what was his remedy for hard times in 1819. We then had a National Bank, and nothing could save us but a Tariff and Public Debt. We now have no National Bank, and the remedy on the same principles would be a Tariff, an assumption of the debts of the States, so as to create a public debt, and a Bank having, perhaps, this public debt for its capital.—*J. Statesman.*

The Lyons Letter and Gen. Harrison's reply; or, Much ado about Nothing.

Before this promised correspondence made its appearance (a correspondence, which, by the bye, conflicts neither in line nor letter, with the policy prescribed by Gen. Harrison's *conscience-keepers*, that "he make no further declarations for the public eye,") we had been induced to believe that the candidate of the Whigs had thrown off all disguise, and had come out clearly and unequivocally on the subject of Abolition—that he had said enough to satisfy all parties that he was no Abolitionist—that he had denied ever giving, or authorized to be given, any pledges or assurances to members of Abolition societies, in the event they supported him for the Presidency—that he had retracted his letter of 1822, in which he said it was "a calumny" to be a friend to slavery—in which he said, at the age of 12 he was a member of an Abolition society, and called on his friend, Judge Gatch, to prove him an Abolitionist. The confidence manifested by the Whigs, in being able to clear up every doubt of General Harrison's soundness on Abolition led us to believe that he had even retracted that part of the Cheviot speech in which after denouncing the Abolitionists by way of stonement and satisfaction, he added, but it is "an object near my heart" to see the whole surplus revenue appropriated towards that object (Abolition).—But here comes the correspondence, and what is it? *Nothing—absolutely nothing.* If it proves anything at all, it proves all the charges made against him on Abolition—it proves him an Abolitionist.—The very flourish with which this correspondence is heralded before the country in the columns of the Richmond Whig and Yeoman—the preparatory notes and all, independent of other circumstances we shall presently point out, demonstrate clearly that it was a failure to draw from Gen. Harrison an expression of his views on Abolition—if not, why has the correspondence been bolstered up by a long article in the R. Whig, and a column, signed, James Lyons, in the Yeoman? If it had been believed, that a mere publication of the naked correspondence would have had the potent and magic influence of quieting all apprehension at the South, in regard to Gen. Harrison's Abolitionism, would all this have been deemed necessary? No—it would not—and these cunning, cider-drinking Whigs know it. Their rule is "to make up in turning round what they lose in dancing;" hence, what they failed to draw from Gen. Harrison, they endeavor to supply by an affect

*Celebration at Browne's Hotel of the final payment of the National Debt.

tion that they had obtained all they desired. This correspondence certainly places the Whig Central Committee in the attitude, said to have been assigned them by the Van Buren Central Committee here—that is, of supporting a man who certainly occupies friendly relations towards the Abolitionists. It will be remembered, when this charge was made, though not exactly in form and substance as the Whig Central Committee would have it, all the proofs exculpatory of General Garrison against Abolition, and on which his friends have since relied, (and among them Mr. Lyons himself,) were then in existence—With these proofs the Whig Convention, held in this city in February last, was satisfied (or pretended to be) as well as Mr. Lyons—but “to make assurance doubly sure,” Mr. Elector Lyons, in the vain hope of getting a little more from the “Old Hero,” though it might not comport exactly with the “policy” of his Committee of *Conscience-keepers*—that “he make no further declarations for the public eye,” and though the South was bound to receive his nomination with something “akin to generous confidence,” and remembering too how “all interests were represented in the Harrisburg Convention, especially those of the South”—opened up this correspondence with Gen. Garrison. We will now proceed to show from the correspondence, that the whole affair is a shallow device to make the people believe Gen. Garrison has avowed something more than heretofore—it is a sheer trick—a mere humbug; he neither denies nor admits any thing on Abolition; in other words, refuses to answer plain enquiries coming from one of “high standing in society,” the only consideration it seems which induced him to answer at all. The motive, as laid down by Mr. Lyons for desiring Gen. Garrison to come out more fully on this subject, is to be found in the following extract:

“In that address, it is roundly asserted, that you are a Federalist and an Abolitionist, and that your friends in the South support you, knowing that you are so. This statement is made here with a knowledge of the views entertained by the Whigs of Virginia, as expressed in the address to the People of the State, published by their Convention, which was held in this city in the month of February last, of which I send you a copy by the mail of this day. I regard the charge, therefore, as an impudent falsehood against you, as it certainly is against the Whigs of Virginia, at whom it is especially levelled, and if made by an anonymous scribbler in a newspaper, might be passed by with contempt. But as the charge is now put forth in an imposing form, and the subject of Abolition is one of absorbing interest and paramount importance—and as I could not, and I am sure the Whigs of Virginia, and the South generally, could not vote for any Abolitionist living to be President of the United States, scarcely sooner than they would for a Florida Indian, and as I have been placed before the People of this State for the office of Elector upon the Whig Ticket, I have thought it due to you, to the Whig cause, and to myself, to ask you to furnish, under your own hand, your denial of the charge, in a letter to me, which I may publish.”

In the above extract, the public will perceive that every pains was taken to impress on Gen. Garrison the importance of a denial, that he was in any way connected with the Abolitionists by word, thought, letter or deed. But does he come out like an “old soldier?”—No! Does he throw aside his committee and speak out fully on this subject? Not at all. Does he say, I not only approve at present my Vincennes speech, but subsequent reflection has satisfied me that Abolition is a heresy which should be scouted down by every good and honorable man—that I repudiate all their schemes and all communion with them—I believe Congress has no power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and “if elected, will go into the Presidential chair the inflexible and uncompromising opponent of any attempt on the part of Congress to interfere with the subject in the District of Columbia or the States where it exists.” Does he use language like this? language, that might naturally have been expected from one who was not an Abolitionist or the candidate of Abolitionists. He is afterwards told too, that “the denial which I expect will, in my opinion, advance your cause with all good and reflecting men throughout the land; but whether it will advance or injure it, it is equally due to yourself and to us that you should furnish it, as I am satisfied that you would be as unwilling to advance your cause by any fraud, as we should be to be made the instruments apparently or dupes of it.” Here, if the Elector had cut short, the General might have found himself in a position not a little embarrassing—in one which would have rendered it necessary for him to call on his committee to reply, that it was the policy of the General’s friends that “he should make no further declarations for the public eye;” but he goes on as it were purposely to relieve the General from any embarrassment on the subject—“Be pleased, therefore, to say to me whether you still entertain the sentiments upon the subject of Abolition expressed in your speech at Vincennes in 1835; whether you were a member of an Abolition Society in Virginia, and whether you have designated the Richmond Society as an Abolition Society; and what was your political connection with the old Federal party.” At first, it was certainly the intention of Mr. Elector Lyons (or if not his intention, the letter will certainly bear no other legitimate construction) to draw out from General Garrison on the subject of Abolition something more than his Vincennes speech; but the still small voice of Garrison’s conscience-keepers whispered in his ear that policy required the General to make no further declarations

for “the public eye,” and true to the instinct that animates the “party without principle,” the purpose of drawing out the Whig Candidate is abandoned, and the whole correspondence comes before the country a miserable farce, an attempt to guill and deceive, and furnishing another to the many proofs which already exist of the contempt, in which the popular intelligence is held by the Whigs—but how does General Garrison reply to this letter? Does he come out with the many avowals before suggested? Does he endorse his Vincennes speech in a manner to convince Abolitionists he is not one of them? Does he not shuffle and prevaricate? In fact, does he not refuse to endorse his Vincennes speech, and can any Southern man be satisfied with his answer? But an endorsement of that speech will not be satisfactory; it existed when it became the “policy of the General’s friends to make no farther declarations for the public eye.” He ran on the same ticket with the Abolitionist Granger, at the last Presidential election, after this speech was delivered—He is now openly supported by Abolitionists, on the ground that he is an Abolitionist, and he must come out clearly and decidedly against them—but how does the General reply?—Availing himself of the timidity manifested by Mr. Lyons, he overlooks the whole letter, calculated to make a serious impression and discourses in this wise about the Vincennes speech—“For I cannot (says he) suppose my personal friends and connections in my native State could think that I was less a gentleman or an honest man than those ardent politicians farther South—Stanly, Alford, Legare, Dawson, King, &c., &c.—They take it for granted that I could not suffer my Vincennes speech and others to be quoted by my friends to show my opinions on the subject of Abolitionism, if I did not hold those opinions at this time.”—This is truly ludicrous.—The Whig candidate is called on by a friend to deny that he is an Abolitionist, and he replies by saying, that he is as much of a gentleman as Stanly, and others in the South—that “they take it for granted” he is no Abolitionist—and therefore cannot be, because he is a gentleman, and permits them to quote his Vincennes speech. Such stuff as this ought to disgrace a schoolboy ten years old. And this is the endorsement which is held up by Mr. Lyons and the Whig Press as a “vanquishing of his enemies.” A vanquishing certainly worthy of such a hero! But how does the “Old Hero” dispose of the other enquiry about his having said in 1822, at the age of 18, that he was a member of an Abolition society. “If I did use the term ‘Abolition’ instead of ‘Humane,’ it was from fatigueness.” Is it possible that any lapse of time could cause a man forget the name and nature of a society of which he had been a member? But let that pass. It matters not whether it was a “Humane” or “Abolition Society”—He appealed to the fact in 1822, that he had been a member of an Abolition Society, and proved it by Judge Gatch, in order to court the support of the Abolitionists—this he neither denies nor explains, and it must therefore be true—in this he admits then he was an Abolitionist, and the Abolitionists use it at the North. According to the argument of the General about the Vincennes speech, he must approve this. Gates, a member of Congress, in a letter to his constituents, appeals to this address as a proof of Garrison’s Abolitionism. Garrison admits that Garrison is as much of a gentleman as Gates, Slade, Adams or Clarke—therefore Garrison is an Abolitionist.—General Garrison endeavors still to get rid of the charge of Federalism, but in vain—it will stick to him like the shirt of Nessus. A man who is ultra Federal in all his notions of Constitutional law—who is supported by the Bank, Tariff, Internal Improvement and Abolition parties—who took office at the hands of both the Adamses—need never expect to make the country believe he is no Federalist. It is worthy of remark, that Garrison is invariably called on by his friends to testify to his own Republicanism, when charged with being a Federalist by those opposed to him. Now, it is a well known principle of law and justice, that no man should be permitted to give evidence for himself. Garrison is charged with Federalism, and his votes, speeches and acts are exhibited. He is immediately said by some one to be a Republican, and Garrison himself comes in to swear to its truth. Every act of his life proves him a Federalist; and if, by the falsehood, misrepresentation and humbug now in daily use, he should ever be elevated to the Presidency, Republican Democracy will receive a blow from which it will perhaps never recover without the horrors of a Revolution. Gen. H. says in the conclusion of his letter, though requested for publication, “I do not wish what I have said above to be published; but I have no objection the facts should be stated and references made to me as having furnished them.” How much caution is here manifested, and how much like the secret influence through Abolition circulars that led to his nomination at Harrisburg—Don’t publish what I say, but merely refer to it and give me up as authority. The whole country is flooded with these secret letters, with injunctions not to publish them. Was the country ever called on before to submit to such degrading requisitions, to support a can-

dide who dare not speak out—who is afraid to have published what he writes? Never! never! The position of Mr. Elector Lyons in this unfinished political drama is truly characteristic of Southern Whiggery at this time. He says—“As the prospect of your election increases, the heart of the patriot revives,” &c.—therefore, you should come out more fully on Abolition. Thus, in effect, saying you have not already done so. But the General does not seem to appreciate this sort of patriotism, or to enjoy the “prospect” alluded to, and refuses to come out more fully; but says, I am a “gentleman,” and therefore would not permit Stanly to quote my speeches if I did not approve them. This is the amount of the “Old Hero’s” reply—and a pretty reply it is, if reply it can be called. What subject is there upon which the General’s speeches, letters, votes and private assurances may not be quoted on both sides?—NOT ONE. He *certainly* has two sets of opinions—one for the South, and another for the North. Poor, Mr. Lyons! he is indeed content with small favors, nothing but a sense of the most impudent egotism or consummate vanity could ever have induced the publication of so impolitic and nonsensical an affair as this *momentous* correspondence. It truly indicates the fallen fortunes of Whiggery.

But is there no other reason, why the Whigs should not be satisfied with this letter of Gen. Garrison’s, apart from its own inherent non-committalism? After this article was written, we received the *Globe*, containing some awful developments on this subject. It appears, that Mr. Calhoun, a member of Congress, from the State of Massachusetts, observing, in the doings of an Abolition Convention, at Springfield, a resolution denouncing Gen. Garrison, writes home to his constituents, under date February 4, 1840, characterizing these proceedings as premature, and telling them he had seen a letter from Gen. Garrison, pronouncing it a “foul slander, that he had, when Governor of Indiana for ten years, done every thing in his power to spread slavery”; and, as proof to the contrary, he repeats the old story of having been a member, at the age of 18, of an Abolition society in this city; that his father left him a great many slaves whom he had set free, and had purchased the freedom of others. This is the substance of Mr. Calhoun’s letter, as remembered by five members of Congress, though Mr. Brown proves that Mr. Calhoun “had written home letters to satisfy the Anti-Slavery men that Garrison was a wholesale Abolitionist.” The letter of Gen. Garrison, to which it refers, is understood to have been addressed to Mr. Evans, from Maine. In what an unenviable light do these disclosures place the Military Chieftain of the Whigs? He writes to Mr. Lyons a letter to serve him and his party for electing in the South, and says, “don’t publish my letter.” He writes to Mr. Evans, who shows the letter to Mr. Calhoun, telling them, “I am an Abolitionist, use it, but don’t publish my letter.” Calhoun seizes upon it, and writes home, making this assurance to the Abolitionists, on the authority of the General himself, but adds, “don’t publish my letter—use it privately”—it is the policy of his friends that he make no further declarations “for the public eye.” This proof is as strong as poison—it effectively uses up the prospects of General Garrison in the South. What will the South vote for an Abolitionist, or one who uses such means to procure their votes? Whether Abolitionist or not, he is alike undeserving the “generous confidence” of Southern men. You will publish, together with this article the Address of Messrs. Jameson, Boyd, Steenrod, Turney, and Bynum, to their constituents, which invite a particular attention, besides several articles from the *Globe* on the same subject. The whole matter should be carefully examined and well weighed by the South. It proves Garrison an Abolitionist, if not totally unfit to represent an honorable, high-minded People. What will the Whigs do? Will they support Garrison? The steamboat affair is fully made out. He has two sets of principles—one for the South and another for the North.

“We recommend to our readers the following remarks, taken from that able and excellent paper, the *Charleston Patriot*:

MR. VAN BUREN AND SLAVERY.

It is matter of surprise as relates to Southern Institutions, that there should be any hesitation in choosing between Mr. Van Buren and Gen. Garrison, to conduct the government of this country. It is susceptible of the plainest proof that the former has purchased peace to the Union and exemption from agitation for at least a considerable period, by casting the moral weight of the government into the scale of Southern rights. He has wrought a re-action in public sentiment in that section of our confederacy where danger, in this regard, was most imminent. He has arrested midway in its fell career, the progress of agitation. He has rolled back the billow of Abolition. So soon as his Inaugural Address was made, it struck at the heart of the Agitators and their plans. Their weapons fell from their hands. Their oratory was dumb. Their inventive powers were paralyzed. Their presses became mute. He dealt them a blow from which they have not yet rallied and recovered.

Who that looks at the present and past condition of Slavery Agitation can doubt this? Who but must assent to this when it was perceived that the Abolitionists openly held their meetings in places appropriate to the adoration of God—that they addressed all classes, through the Press and by means of the Orator—the old by appeals to their moral sensibilities—the young by pictures addressed to their senses and imagination.— Who now sees an Abolition paper or pamphlet or picture? Who hears of Abolition harangues? The fell spirit—the demon of agitation, has been exorcised, at least for a time. We owe this public blessing to the open, manly declaration of a Northern man with Southern principles, that at all hazards he will maintain those pecuniary privileges of the South which are among the guarantees of the Constitution.

Since this declaration by Mr. Van Buren, where is the slave-holder that, guided by the instinct of interest, does not feel self-assured that his property stands on a more secure basis than it had for some time previous to its promulgation? Which of our Southern statesmen that in their sagacious conclusions do not perceive that by this declaration we have renewed the bond of Union—strengthened the links of interest between the North and South—made doubtful allies steadfast friends—infused confidence in those frontier States that formed the outposts of our defence, Virginia and Maryland? In short, converted a region of agitation into a land of peace?

Now, not only has this great good been effected for the South and the whole Union, but it was wrought at the most opportune moment. It arrested the spread in our country of the anti-slavery movement in England, just as it had acquired energy and activity, by the aid of the British Government, to be newly envenomed with the diffusive poison of *propagandism*. Mr. Van Buren boldly met it by a counter movement. The fatal spirit had passed our Atlantic frontier. British West India emancipation was hailed by Northern agitators as the advent of American emancipation.—They were emboldened to make renewed efforts.—Their incendiary orators were armed with new energies. Their press became invigorated with fresh materials for excitement and agitation. At this most opportune moment, we say, Mr. Van Buren threw himself into the breach. He put the seal of Government condemnation on Abolition principles. The audacity of the agitators was at an end. They were stopped in their schemes. Their weapons of mischief fell from their hands, as if by magic. This shows the moral power of government for good or for evil. This demonstrates to the South, the advantage of a counterpoise in civil authority, to balance the factious force, which party, constituted on incendiary principles and aiming at the overthrow of Southern institutions acquires thro' the action and indirect support of a foreign Government. We say, therefore, that the South owes to Mr. Van Buren a lasting debt of gratitude. She is bound to him for having given her new guarantees for the safety of her institutions and for the security of the life and property which their preservation involves.

HENRICO COUNTY.

At a meeting of a number of the Democratic Republican Committee of Vigilance for the County of Henrico, assembled at Tree Hill, on Saturday, the 30th May, Col. Benjamin B. R. Barker was called to the Chair, and Jno. O. Goddin appointed Secretary.

Whereupon, the following gentlemen were added to the Committee:—Richard D. Phillips, James M. Selden, Absalom Blackburn, Benjamin West, Henry Tally, Fleming Patman, Wm. Hutcheson, Joseph Blunt, Jno. C. Allen, Albert Aikin, Elijah Throgmorton, Wm. Harwood, Albert Acree, Archelias Echo, James Tuck, Ballard Ammons, Wm. H. Ammons, Wm. M. Pierce, Henry Vaughan, Holburn Cottrell, Chas. Cottrell, Walter Lewis, and Burwell Harlow.

The following preamble and resolutions were then offered up for the consideration of the meeting by Philip Mayo, Esq., and were severally considered and unanimously adopted:

Whereas, we, of the People of Henrico County, here assembled, have, with unfeigned surprise, heard of the organization of political clubs in many of our cities and towns, denominating themselves "Tippecanoe Clubs," the avowed object of which is to direct and control the political action of this great Republic; as the Jacobin Club, in the city of Paris, ruled, for a time, the destinies of unhappy France. And, whereas, all history admonishes us of the danger of such clubs, inflamed by the impassioned declamation of ambitious orators; and, recollecting that we are especially warned against the machinations and devices of such clubs, by the father of his country, in the following impressive words:

"They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation, the will of a party, often a small, but artful and enterprising minority of a community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans, digested by com-

mon councils, and modified by mutual interests.—However combinations or associations of the above description may, now and then, answer popular ends, they are likely in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards, the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion."

And whereas, we believe these Tippecanoe Clubs are just such associations as our great and good Washington warned his countrymen against, in his Farewell Address, and recollecting that our Republican institutions were designed to secure the rights, liberties, property, and happiness of all the people, without distinction of party, sect, denomination or condition, and that they were framed at a time when we had no large towns, and no chartered monopolies, were we now to yield up our liberties to these chartered companies in our cities, at the bidding of their agents and attorneys, their debtors and dependants, and their Tippecanoe Clubs, we should prove ourselves recreants to the principles of our fathers—counting as nothing the blood and toil and sufferings, by which they delivered us from the tyranny of Great Britain, with her enormous Bank, her East India Company, her privileged orders, and other instruments of oppression, by which she maintains a splendid Government over an enslaved people? Therefore, deeply impressed with these and like considerations, and in view of the unparalleled efforts and artful devices of the old Federalists and "their new recruits," (called Whigs) to "usurp for themselves the reins of Government;" and well convinced that their success would not end with a change of rulers only, but lead on to a total revolution, by which the great mass of our people would be brought into subjection to a privileged class in our cities; who by means of the "credit system," (that is banks, and the facilities they afford for speculation,) would possess themselves "in the course of time and things" of all the most valuable lands in the country; and reduce a hardy and independent yeomanry to a dependent tenantry and an impoverished peasantry: We the people of Henrico, here assembled, do solemnly pledge ourselves to each other, and to our Democratic brethren throughout the Union, that we will use every honorable means to counteract the machinations of Whiggery by which it is endeavoring, in contempt of the intelligence of the American people, to force upon them a Black Cockade Federalist as their President.

Resolved, That (any three of whom may act,) be, and they are, hereby appointed, by the Committee of Vigilance for the county of Henrico, a Sub-Committee, whose duty it shall be to correspond with other Democratic Committees and Associations, and report their proceedings to the general meetings.

Resolved, That we will use all honorable means to promote the re-election of Martin Van Buren, who has proved himself a faithful public servant, an able and dignified statesman, and a firm, consistent and inflexible Republican of the Jeffersonian school.

The blank in the first resolution was then filled by the names of the following gentlemen, (that of the Chairman of this meeting having been added by the meeting:)—Philip Mayo, John O. Mosby, James M. Selden, William O. George, Logan McCoul, John O. Goddin, Richard Jeffries, Jno. Carter, James Hill, Benj. B. Barker, Jackson F. Childrie and Henry Cox.

It was then unanimously *Resolved*, That the Editors of the Enquirer and Crisis be requested to publish these proceedings.

The meeting then adjourned.
BENJ. B. R. BARKER, Chairman.
J. O. GODDIN, Secretary.

¶ A meeting of the Democrats of Greenville is requested at July Court (1st Monday,) and the Committee of Vigilance is especially desired to attend.

ABOLITION.

Mr. Van Buren says—"I will give no pledge."—*Rich. Whig.*
Mr. Van Buren said, before his election, "Should I be elected, I must go into the Presidential Chair the inflexible and uncompromising opponent of any attempt on the part of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, against the wishes of the slaveholding States; and also with a determination equally decided, to resist the slightest interference with the subject in the States where it exists." Is not this tantamount to a "pledge?" Will Garrison say as much?—We dare him. Will he endorse Clay's Speech, for which he was "laid upon the shelf" by Abolitionists as well as Southern Whigs. We dare him to do it.—He is afraid.

The Lynchburg Virginian has a long article arraigning Mr. Van Buren for appropriations to works of Internal Improvement. This is unjust. We deny, that one cent of money has been expended on works of Internal Improvement having their origin under this Administration, or otherwise coming in conflict with the principles of Gen. Jackson's Maysville veto. We call upon the Virginian to enlighten its readers. What can

nal, what road has Mr. Van Buren constructed? In what Message has he recommended an expenditure for such an object? We ask the Virginian.

PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

The Democratic Republicans have held meetings in Chesterfield, King & Queen and Loudoun. Strong preambles and strong resolutions were adopted by each. The news is cheering from every part of the State—Democratic associations should be formed in every county and neighborhood, and that without delay. Meet often and discuss political questions; try and turn your countymen from the awful gulf of Federalism, which now lies wide open to swallow them up. Great good may be done. One has been formed in this city, with the most beneficial results. If all the counties would do the like, we could sweep the State this fall with ease. We call on our old county to be up—on the Northern Neck to move—in fact, on the whole State and send us their proceedings. Van Buren is our candidate—he is a Democrat. Garrison is the candidate of the piebald Whigs; a Federalist of '96; a Bank, Tariff, and Internal Improvement man, and is now an approved and admitted Abolitionist. Choose ye, Virginians. Can you hesitate?

RICHMOND, Va., SATURDAY, JUNE 27.

"A wise and frugal Government which shall restrain men from injuring one another; shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pugnacious industry and improvement; and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of government."—*Mr. JEFFERSON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.*

Lieut. Hooe's Case.

We have received an able No. on the conduct of Mr. Botts, touching this case, which will appear in our next. In the mean time, we submit another:

COMMUNICATED.

CASE OF LIEUT. HOOE.

There is something so despicable and mean in the Whig's article of June 25, touching this silly affair, as almost absolutely to defy comment. Now, in reference to the main point harped on by the Whig, "the receipt of negro testimony against white persons in the South, there can be and is not a difference of opinion among Southern men. We ourselves believe, the "practice on board our ships of war," to the contrary notwithstanding, that such testimony should in all cases be rejected, the feelings, habits and prejudices of the South, to say nothing of the distinctive difference in the two races, marking too clearly for doubt, an inferiority which should forever disqualify them—all forbid it. Our Southern institutions forbid it; our State laws forbid it. These considerations are sufficient. But where and what is the remedy? No State has a right to enact a disqualifying law which would operate to exclude such testimony in Courts created by Federal authority or any other State of the Union. This being so, then each State would receive or disqualify it according to the prevalence of feelings favorable or against the "negro race; and thus in fact, by a shifting of the venue to points where this feeling was strongest, it would at all times be within the power of the commanding officer, if disposed to do so, to secure its reception. This would be manifestly unjust and improper. Then, where and what is the remedy? It is to be found nowhere else than in a law by Congress to disqualify negroes from giving testimony against white persons, especially those born in slaveholding States. Let the proposition be made in Congress, and we hazard nothing in the prediction, that every Whig North of Mason's and Dixon's line would vote against it. We hope that our friends will expose the trickery displayed in this affair, by taking up the matter and passing a law of disqualification, which the "Hon." John M. Botts dared not propose for fear of placing his Abolition friends in an awkward dilemma. But what is the true state of the facts in this case? Does it furnish any thing—one single jot or tittle of evidence upon which the President can or ought to be censured?—Has not substantial justice been done? Did the negroes prove any new fact? Was Lt. Hooe condemned on their testimony? Were not a majority of the officers who tried him Southern men—Whigs?—and of his own selection? Ought he then to complain that Mr. Van Buren did not set aside the proceedings?—Could he have done so, knowing as he did, that no law of Congress was shown disqualifying the negroes, and that the proceedings in other respects were "regular"?—The opinions of the law officers of the Government on this subject, published in the last Crisis and Enquirer, were conclusive on the main point; that is, whether Lieut. Hooe was convicted on a single specification by the negroes. It is a common law principle, (says the Attorney General,) that "where, upon the whole case, justice has been done and a verdict is substantially right, no new trial will be granted, even though there may have been some mistakes committed. Sufficient justification for assenting to the present application will not be found. This makes an inquiry unnecessary in regard to the objection itself."

What says the District Attorney?

"The testimony thus objected to may be entirely rejected without affecting the sentence of the court—

They were examined as to the second charge, and of that the accused was acquitted.

Now, it is clear that the question for the decision of the President was not, whether the proceedings should be set aside, as the Whig falsely states, because Lieut. Hooe had been "reprimanded and dismissed upon the testimony of two servants of Capt. Uriah P. Levy, but whether they should be set aside on account of "testimony objected to," which was "in no respect material to the finding of the Court." This is proven by the whole history of the case, as gathered from the record of its proceedings, "on a careful examination by the law officer," and yet the Whig unblushingly informs its readers that Lieut. Hooe was "reprimanded and dismissed on the strength of negro testimony." When such falsehoods obtain credence with any portion of the community, what evils may not be expected to ensue? The Whig's allusion to the Federal Court here is a poor attempt at illustration—there is no sort of parallel in the cases. Our laws declare black persons shall not be competent to give testimony against white men. In the case of Hooe, ship Macedonia, not being within the jurisdiction of the laws of Florida, there was no such positive enactment by Congress, and a board of Southern officers felt it their duty, in the absence of such law, to overrule the objection of Lieutenant Hooe; and having every reason to believe that usage, from the necessity of the case perhaps, had sanctioned the principle that in Courts Martial such testimony ought not to be respected. We mean, however, to make no excuse for the Court: they were Whigs and selected by Hooe to sit in judgment on his case—Had they taken the responsibility of rejecting the testimony objected to, we should have been rejoiced—As they have not, however, and have not convicted Hooe "on the strength of negro testimony," as alleged by the Whig, we must and do, in the name of justice, protest against the effort of his friends to arraign Mr. Van Buren, who had "no connection with the proceedings," his "approval not being necessary," as Mr. Paulding himself says.—Upon a view of this whole case, ample cause is afforded of gratulating the South on the firmness and patriotism of Mr. Van Buren as regards the vital question of Abolition. These proceedings clearly make out two facts important to be observed—they should inspire the South with increased confidence in the man. The first fact is: That a Board of Southern Whig officers sitting in judgment on their brother officer of the Navy decided to admit "negro testimony" against him—The second fact is: That a Northern man with Southern feelings deemed such decision of so much importance, that he called upon the law officers to aid him in an examination of the case, and determined only not to interfere, when he ascertained from them that "THE TESTIMONY THUS OBJECTED TO MAY BE ENTIRELY REJECTED WITHOUT AFFECTING THE SENTENCE OF THE COURT."

Let us hear no more of this silly humbug

PHILO.

The following article from the *Globe* wrings the withers of the "Honorable" Representative of this District. Why has he not moved effectually in this business? Instead of contenting himself with the poor triumph of a mere party move, and saying as he did on the 12th inst., that "his object was attained; that he was satisfied; that he had got the facts before the country," why did not Mr. John Minor Botts come forward, and move the reference of a resolution to the Judiciary Committee, regulating the law of evidence, and excluding negro testimony from our Federal tribunals? Why did he not do it? Was he afraid that Slade, and his colleagues of the Executive Committee, viz: Clarke and Truman Smith, and Saltonstall and others would object to the proposition, or shirk the question? For one, we say, if they have not moved in it, let our friends do it.

(From Tuesday's Globe.)

CASE OF LIEUTENANT HOOE.

"It is to be regretted that Mr. Botts, instead of embodying in his resolutions in relation to the trial of this officer, a direct censure on the PRESIDENT, had not simply called for a copy of the proceedings, the original of which, as we are informed, had been previously placed in his hands; or, what is still more to be regretted by his friends, that he did not, being perfectly acquainted with the points at issue, in order to save time at this late period of the session, move for a copy of the proceedings, and a reference to the Judiciary Committee with instructions to report.

"By this course he would have avoided the imputation of presenting resolutions for the sole purpose, in the phrase of the day, "of making political capital" by distributing, or being instrumental in distributing, a condemnatory censure of the PRESIDENT throughout the Southern States, either BEFORE it had been presented to the House, or AFTER it had been rejected by that body.

"For this genuine Whig manoeuvre, we have charged Mr. Botts with being neither actuated by a regard for Lieut. Hooe, nor for the laws and institutions of the South; for, had his object been either to remedy the past, or provide against the future, he would have at once,

and directly, invoked the action of Congress on the subject, by pursuing the course we have pointed out. This was the most speedy and effectual mode of disposing of the question. No one would have objected, and it would have unquestionably received the sanction of a majority of the House. He, however, chose a different course. He preferred a series of resolutions, embodying a direct censure of the President, and thus forced the friends of the administration to oppose them. Can he therefore complain, that, on finding these rejected resolutions, printed in handbills, and distributed in every quarter where they were likely to operate injuriously on the Administration, this paper has charged him, and now repeats the charge, with having had no other purpose in bringing them forward, than that which has been so completely accomplished, namely, to make political capital?

"If, however, the motives we have ascribed to Mr. Botts were not those which in reality influenced his course on this occasion, he has now an opportunity to demonstrate the injustice of our imputations. The case of Lieutenant Hooe is before the House. There is yet time for the Judiciary Committee to report, and for Congress to decide.

"The subject is one in which every officer of the navy is deeply interested, whether as a member of a court martial, or on trial before it; and since Mr. Botts has raised doubts on the subject, it becomes proper that all should know whether or not these courts, when held on board our ships of war on the high seas, and in the bays and harbors of the U. S., are to be governed by local or general provisions of law. Justice to Lieut. Hooe, justice to the members of the court by which he was tried, and justice to the guilty, who may escape, as well as the innocent, who may suffer through the uncertainties of the law, requires a prompt decision of this critical and important question.

"We therefore call on Mr. Botts, not only in the name of justice and expediency, but in behalf of his own reputation, which such a course will do much to relieve from the vehement suspicion that rests upon him, in relation to his real object in bringing forward his resolutions—we call upon him promptly to move a reference of the case to the Judiciary Committee. No one will probably oppose it. His friends, Messrs. Slade, Peck, Hunt, Fillmore, and J. C. Clark, will moreover certainly sustain him in case of need, or the world will justly accuse them of base ingratitude in deserting a friend who so faithfully adheres to a party, of which Abolition is the animating principle.

"We look to see our call promptly attended to by Mr. Botts; and as the course he has thought proper to pursue, has brought the case of Lieutenant Hooe before the public with a view to cast censure not only on the President, but on all those who had any agency, either in the sentence or its confirmation, we shall take the earliest occasion to remark further on the subject."

Gen. Harrison's Speech at Columbus and his letter to Joseph L. Williams—The Oswego Correspondence and the Committee of Managers.

When it was first announced through the public papers, that the candidate of the Whigs had thrown himself into the hands of a committee of his friends, and refused to answer any enquiries touching his opinions on the various political questions of the day, it was declared to be a forgery by the press and public men advocating the election of the Harrisburg nominee—but when the most indubitable and conclusive evidence of its authenticity was furnished, the same men and papers wheeled right about, and did not hesitate to justify and defend what they shortly before regarded and believed to be a forgery. Of such twisting, turning, elastic and pliable materials is this Whig party composed, that they can conform themselves to any state of facts or circumstances—they can assume any color their candidate assumes. If black, they are black; if blue, they are blue too; if white, none so white as they. In truth, these Whigs are chameleons, and hold no opinions or principles, except those reflected from the great mirror of "POLICY." In this state of the case, the great Mogul of Federalism himself, after witnessing for months efforts to prove and disprove the genuineness of this Correspondence, comes forward and declares in a public Speech delivered at Columbus in Ohio, but a week or so since, "I have no committee, fellow-citizens, confidential or other." How unkind to be sure it was in the General, to rack and torment his friends in this wise! They had been placed in the predicament of pronouncing the Oswego Correspondence a forgery—of then having justified and defended it on the ground, that it was evidence of true Republicanism in the General to have the duty assigned others of replying to the immense number of letters continually pouring in upon him for information, as to his opinions on the political questions of the day; but the General now tells them, "I have no committee, confidential or other." But, let us examine a little further this precious production of the General in Columbus, and see if it affords no evidence of imbecility; and if not, whether it does not furnish the most satisfactory evidence, (the admissions of the General himself,) that he is in fact, at this time, and was at the time and before he spoke at Columbus,

in the care and keeping of a committee, if not "confidential," at least "other." What says the General?—"It is true, that I employed my friend, Major Gwynne, to aid me in returning replies to some of the numerous questions propounded to me by letters." What does this prove? Does it prove nothing? True, the General denies that he has a "confidential committee or other," to take care of his person and to write letters for him; but, does he deny that he gave his friend, Major Gwynne, authority to write the letters addressed over his signature to the Oswego Association and others, with that of J. C. Wright, (the reviler of Jefferson, and whom Gen. Harrison terms his political friend,) and O. M. Spencer? In that letter, Mr. Gwynne says, "Your letter of the 31st ult., has been placed in our possession with a view to early attention." He then goes on—"As from his confidential committee, [yes, confidential is the word,] you will look upon this response; and, if the policy observed by the committee should not meet with your approbation, you will attribute the error rather to ourselves and his immediate advisers, than General Harrison." What is that policy? That the "General make no farther declaration of his principles for the public eye, whilst occupying his present position." It will be observed here, that the testimony of Mr. Gwynne is in direct conflict with the statements of Gen. Harrison, and that one or the other states what is not so.—Gen. Harrison says he has no "confidential committee," but "employed my friend, Maj. Gwynne, to aid me," &c., in answering letters. Mr. Gwynne says, "your letter has been placed in our hands," &c., and, "as from his confidential committee, you will look upon this response," &c., and if the policy should not be approved of by you, why, the error is our own, and not Gen. Harrison's—i. e., we are responsible and General Harrison is not—we undertake he shall make no further declarations for "THE PUBLIC EYE"—yet Gen. Harrison has no committee!! In the meantime, too, whilst this policy is observed, the committee "cannot help expressing the hope, that our friends everywhere will receive the nomination of Gen. Harrison, with something akin to generous confidence." Was ever such an impudent and insulting demand made upon the citizens of this country? A candidate for the highest office in the gift of the people, not only refuses through his confidential committee to answer questions propounded to him by those whose suffrages he seeks, but absolutely requires them to receive his nomination with "something akin to generous confidence." A generous confidence it would be indeed, to receive a nomination made through the influence of Abolitionism at Harrisburg! The South would surely place herself in an humble and degraded position, to substitute a "generous confidence" for all her long-cherished principles and institutions.—The Speech at Columbus was not written out from notes furnished by Gen. Harrison, but purports to be sketched down from memory by the Editor of the "Columbus Confederate." It is much lauded by the Whig. If it deserved any praise, that praise is certainly due to the Editor or one of the confidential committee. That the old General may have said something, is not at all improbable; that we hold him responsible for it, is true; that the Editor could have written out a Speech which he had only heard in a noisy group of cider-drinkers, is altogether improbable; that the whole thing was concocted, cut and dried, for the occasion, is much more susceptible of belief. The whole tale about its being an off-hand "three minute affair," is a perfect humbug—not a word of truth in it. But, whether made on the occasion, or three weeks or months before, it is a miserable, tatty-washy production—a perfect failure. Full of complaints against the friends of Mr. Van Buren for vilifying him, but does not condescend to say in what, as regards any important question. Denies and admits he keeps a committee—makes no revelations in the Speech or letter as to his present views on Abolition, a Bank, Tariff or Internal Improvements—tries to claim credit for magnanimity towards Mr. V. Buren, and even says, that he has sometimes defended him against his own friends. If such a spirit as this really animated the "old Hero," it is but just and proper; for, never in the annals of political warfare, has an innocent and upright man been more vilified, traduced, slandered and lied on, than Mr. Van Buren, and it is well known, that no man has ever surpassed him in the exercise of those virtues that should mark the conduct of rivals towards one another.

MR. POINSETT'S LETTER.

This able and luminous paper will forever put to flight the idle and silly fears manifested by the Whigs at the proposition to organize the militia. It will be seen from this letter, that if the bill had become a law, it would have introduced no single feature not found in the existing law, but one which authorized the President, by the consent of the State, to call out the militia for training. As the letter is long and may not be read, we will give a brief synopsis of its leading points. 1st: then Gen. Knox's plan proposed to divide the militia into three classes—the Advance—the Main, and Reserve corps, composed of the young, middle-aged and old men. It proposed to clothe, arm and equip the advance corps at the expense of the U. S., and encamp together or

THE CRISIS.

legions all the youth of said corps in each State—to discipline the youth of 18 and 19, 30 days, and those of 20 years 10 days in each year—to pay commissioned officers and not non-commissioned officers or privates, at an expense of \$300,240.

Mr. Jefferson was in favor of the principle of classifying the militia, and proposed a select number of 300,000.

Mr. Madison was also in favor of this principle. In 1812, the Legislature of Kentucky, recommended to Congress the principle of classifying the militia, on the ground, that it obviates the "danger and inconvenience resulting from a standing army."

In 1817, the War Department, on a resolution of Congress, reported a system embracing the principle of classifying the militia into the minor, junior and senior classes—to be assembled at Cantonnments not more than twice a year, subsisted and equipped at the expense of the United States; arsenals and depots were to be established in each State or Territory. This plan was referred to the committee of which General Harrison was chairman. A report came from that committee, adopting the principles recommended, and grafted upon it a proposition to educate all the youth in the U. S., in gymnastics or tactics, at the public expense. This plan, however, he continues, would "absorb all the resources of the nation," and he then proposes to train the officers and sergeants one month, at an expense of \$1,735,500.

Mr. Monroe urged the organization and discipline of the militia repeatedly on Congress.

In 1825, Mr. Barbour, the then President's Secretary at War, assembled a board of regular and militia officers, to take into consideration the subject of organizing the militia. Their report and numerous letters from the Governors of the States, recommend the principle of classifying the militia and training part instead of the whole mass. They designate the number of 400,000 for this object, and proposed camps of instruction for the officers alone, to be paid during encampment—number of camps 104, and officers estimated at 16,750, at an expense of \$150 per day for 10 days. Gen. Jackson recommended an organization of the militia by classes.

Mr. Poinsett recommends an organization of the militia by classes. He proposes to abstract from the mass of the militia 200,000 men, to be equipped and trained for 10 days in the year, at an expense (to pay officers and privates) of half a million. He proposes to train the militia of each State within the limits of that State, near depots of arms to be furnished by the U. S., and therein makes it less onerous than the existing law, which the Whigs approve. He proposes State Legislation, to enable the President to carry the training into effect, except in cases where citizens might volunteer their services. He proposes to subject the militia when thus called out, to the rules and articles of war already in existence—and all this to avoid a standing army.—This is the substance of Mr. Poinsett's proposition, and who can doubt the patriotic motives which prompted them? Can any man believe, that Mr. P., distinguished for his Republicanism from earliest youth, and a consistency unsurpassed by that of any public man in the U. S., a man, who, by the lustre of his intellect, and the force and beauty of his principles extorted from an Emperor on the other side of the Atlantic, the confession, that "if I were not an Emperor, I would be a Republican;" a man, who nobly and gallantly headed a foreign force, which was tendered him by one of the South American Republics, and rescued 10 American whale ships from the authority of a neighboring sister; a man, whose Republicanism prompted him, after receiving a ball through the collar of his coat, to rush to the balcony of his residence in the city of Mexico, with the flag of his country waving over his head, when that residence was surrounded with an armed soldiery, threatening him with death and the building with destruction, on account of the Republican principles he inculcated and the Republicans who had fled for refuge to the house of the American minister. Call him an enemy to his country—charge Poinsett with a design to subvert her liberties! Malignant the heart and palsied be the tongue that could be guilty of such loud and crying ingratitude. No man deserves better of his country than Mr. Poinsett; but these Whigs scruple at no misrepresentation, however flagitious; no falsehood, however base, to deceive and gull the people. If the plan for organizing the militia is liable to objection, and in some respects, it may be; for Mr. P. expressly says, "I do not pretend to say, that the system I have proposed is the best that can be devised," the objection applies to the author of the plan, and not the President, who had no "knowledge of its details" previous to its being communicated to Congress, as Mr. P. further says. What now will these Whigs do for something to scare and humbug the people?—they are completely unversed of their favorite theme, the militia bill. It is knocked entirely from under them. Mr. Van Buren, whom they wished mainly to injure, it seems had never seen the scheme. Mr. Poinsett has avowed it as his own. Two committees of Congress have reported against it—and the thing is now absolutely dead. What will these Whigs do? Where will they get employment next? Will the Lyons letter

comfort them? Will the Hooe case avail them? We wonder what these humbugging slangwhangers will do next? Our friends in the country will please advise us of their tricks.

The Richmond Whig is certainly a most disingenuous and reckless print. It scruples at nothing, to attain an end. It matters not whether its falsehoods are exposed or permitted to pass by—it rants on in the same strain of reckless slangwhanging, in disregard of all moral and conscientious restraints. Its late article on the militia bill furnishes proof to satisfy all men of all parties, that its statements are not worthy of any confidence whatever. Knowing, as that paper certainly does, that the whole subject has been disposed of by Reports from both Houses of Congress asking to be discharged from its further consideration; and that those reports are more likely to indicate the views of the Administration, than those which have emanated from the War Department on calls by a committee of Congress, or even the letter of Mr. Poinsett to the Editor of the Enquirer, it still harps on some of the provisions of the project submitted by that officer, which have been explained, and even makes Mr. P. approve in his late letter, those very provisions, and pronounce them "less tyrannical and oppressive" than the present system, "if adopted."

1st. The Whig states, that Mr. Poinsett's bill requires the militia to furnish their own arms. This is not so. Mr. P. proposed to establish depots of arms for their use, as a part of the system, when training. The committees of Congress, representing the Administration, have recommended, when the Treasury shall be in a condition to do so, the purchase of arms for the whole mass. In this, Mr. P.'s plan is certainly less burdensome than the existing law, which requires each man to arm himself.

2d. The Whig says, that Mr. Poinsett's bill divided the Union into eight districts, and empowers the President to call them in any part of the district for training. This is not so. Mr. P. expressly says, it is not designed to abstract a single individual from the State to which he belongs; and that it was contemplated to call forth the militia in the shape of requisitions on the Governors, to which they might or might not consent. Gen. Harrison, however, is still more objectionable on this head—yet the Whig sees in the lineaments of his face the next President of the U. S. Every other feature of the bill is in precise conformity to the existing law, and whatever objections may be urged to it, will apply to that. But the whole matter is disposed of by Congress—and we hope the ear of the country will no longer be grated with the croakings and blood-on-ours of the slangwhanging humbug Whigs on this subject. We now call on them to defend Gen. Harrison's scheme, avowed so lately as January last, to the Louisville Legion, or make him retract it. Will they do it? Not they. One thing may be safely said—every President from the foundation of the Government, except the elder Adams, (whose standing army was supported by Gen. Harrison,) has been in favor of organizing the militia. Mr. Van Buren is in favor of nothing more.—This organization he recommended to the consideration of Congress. His Secretary spoke of a plan he was prepared to submit—it was called for by a committee of Congress—it was furnished. Mr. Van Buren had no previous knowledge of its details, and therefore could never have approved it. It was Mr. Poinsett's plan exclusively. He avows it. He finds it liable to some objections; he does not pretend, that it is perfect; he modifies and explains it. The whole subject was before committees of Congress, and is disposed of—the matter is dead and buried. Yet, these hyena Whigs will even dig up the dead to carry a purpose—they will still harp on the provisions of this plan of Mr. P., which they know have been explained by him. Where will the folly of these Whigs lead us? Will they now defend Gen. Harrison's scheme? We shall see! We recommend our friends in the country to press steadily these views upon the people, and make the Whig leaders "toe the mark" in defence of the favorite scheme of their caged Mogul.

It is truly strange, that either doubt or surprise should be expressed about the wish and endeavor of General Harrison to procure the passage of a law by the Legislature of Ohio, when he was a member of that body, authorizing the sale of poor men into servitude. The attempt to carry such a law, or rather the enormity of that attempt, gave rise to an excitement at the time, well-remembered by many; and that it should have faded from the recollection of any person conversant with public events, gives a strong example of these truths, that acts the most reprehensible and outrageous may be overlooked or forgotten, and that bold and unscrupulous men will eagerly avail themselves of these circumstances, in pushing their selfish designs. Here is the case of a proceeding unparalleled perhaps in any country since the dawn of civilization; an occurrence of less than 10 years standing, and one recorded in the archives of a great Commonwealth, which is nevertheless flatly denied by some, whilst others, who will not venture as far, express an incredulity in its existence

When the scheme for this law was brought forward, indignation opposition and ultimate defeat were encountered by it, from the friends of liberty and justice. It was vehemently assailed by Gen. Robert Lucas, then in the Senate, and the same man who was President of the first Jackson Convention which assembled in Baltimore, and afterwards the Democratic Governor of Ohio. The odious provision of the bill, being part of the 19th section, the remarks of Gov. Lucas in opposition to it, and the proceeding had upon the motion made to strike it out, are as follow, and except the Speech of Gen. Lucas, were extracted from the Journal of the Senate of Ohio:

"Tuesday, January 30, 1821.

"The Senate met according to adjournment. The Senate then, according to the order of the day, resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole upon the bill from the House, entitled an act for the punishment of certain offences, and after some time spent therein, the Speaker (Allen Trimble) resumed the Chair.—Mr. Fithian then moved to strike out the 19th section of the said bill, as follows:

"Be it further enacted, That when any person shall be imprisoned, either upon execution or otherwise, for the non-payment of a fine or costs, or both, it shall be lawful for the Sheriff of the county to sell out such person as a servant to any person within this State, who will pay the whole amount due for the shortest period of service: of which sale, public notice shall be given at least 10 days; and upon such sale being effected, the Sheriff shall give to the purchaser a certificate thereof, and deliver over the prisoner to him, from which time, the relation between such purchaser and the prisoner shall be that of master and servant, until the time of service expires, &c.

"Mr. Lucas said, he would vote for the motion to strike out the section. He considered it objectionable in every point of view. He considered it not only a violation of that provision of the Constitution which declares, that there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in this State; but it contains principles of the most revolting character. It declares, that a person unable to pay a fine or costs shall be liable to be sold, and that the individual who will pay the fine and costs shall be the purchaser. What will be the operation of this section, said Mr. Lucas. We will suppose a case: Suppose one of the Patriots of the Revolution should be insulted by an enemy of the country, or a Tory, who had fought against him in the struggle for liberty, and he should be provoked to commit an assault in defending the honor of the Government, by our laws he might be prosecuted and fined. He is poor and unable to pay the fine.—What would follow under the provisions of this section? He is publicly advertised for sale. He is dragged by the crew along the streets; the man, who provoked the assault bids the amount of the fine and costs for the shortest term of service, say forty years. THE OLD PATRIOT IS KNOCKED OFF TO HIS PERSECUTOR, AND DRIVEN IN TRIUMPH INTO BONDAGE! Any unfortunate citizen, who, in an unguarded moment, might be thus subjected to the payment of a fine, would be liable to be sold, under the section, and DRIVEN INTO SLAVERY BY A FREE NEGRO, should such negro choose to become the purchaser. This would be revolting to every principle of humanity, and a disgrace to the age in which we live."

These are the sentiments of a man of practical good sense—a patriot and a Democrat. What was the course of Wm. H. Harrison, upon the obnoxious and disgraceful proposal? The Journal proceeds to inform us, that the "yeas and nays" being called for, those who voted in the affirmative, (that is, for striking out the odious section,) "were Messrs. Beasley, Brown, Fithian, Gass, Heaton, Jennings, Lucas, Matthews, McLaughlin, McMillan, Newcomb, Robb, Russel, Sepfield, Shelby, Spencer, Stone, Swearingen, Thompson and Womeldorf—20; and those who voted in the negative, (that is, for retaining this section,) "were Messrs. Baldwin, Cole, Foster, William H. Harrison, McLean, Aswall, Pollock, Ruggles, Roberts, Wheeler and Speaker—12."

In looking back upon these events, and in trying by them the qualifications of Gen. Harrison for the station of President of the United States, every one must be impressed with his entire inability to comprehend either the genius of our institutions, or the character, the feelings and habits of a nation of freemen. What notion of either can be possessed by the man who could think of subjecting one citizen of the country, the equal in rights of every other, to a degrading bondage under his fellow-citizen? And what is far more monstrous and revolting, would make his misfortune the excuse for this degradation, viz: his inability to pay a fine or the costs of a suit! Yet he who thus thought and thus acted, is called the candidate of the poor man—the candidate of the inhabitants of log cabins; and his brother Federalists who are laboring to come into power under his mantle, will clamor about the tyranny of Andrew Jackson, because he rescued the People's money from the Banks, which had squandered and misappropriated

it, and put into the public Treasury—against Martin Van Buren, because he has determined to keep that money in the Treasury, and will not return it to the Banks to be again squandered or run away with by defaulters, and because he has recommended to Congress to put arms in the hands of the freemen of this land, and to teach them to use these arms for the protection of their families and their liberties, either against foreign enemies, or against Aristocrats and Federalists at home, who would sell them or their children into slavery, or attempt to oppress them in any other manner. Neither Andrew Jackson nor Martin Van Buren, nor any other man less arbitrary in his principles, or less ignorant of our Government, or of our People, than William H. Garrison, ever dreamed of selling an American citizen as a slave, because he was poor. By this process, the Banks, who can make as much rag money as they please, the rich merchants, who are their favorites, and the wealthy Aristocrats throughout the country, could have scores of white slaves at command; for, it has been so ordered by Divine Providence, that many of the People, many of the most virtuous, and honest, and pious amongst them, are guilty of this Garrisonian crime of poverty—many of them, therefore, by the Garrisonian rule ought to be slaves.

The Lyons Letter and the Letter to Evans—Gen. Garrison caught in his own Trap, and two sets of Opinions made out.

Previous to the Harrisburg Convention, the name of Gen. Garrison was never mentioned by friend or foe in the South, as likely to come before that body with the least prospect of receiving the nomination. Public sentiment in the South had settled down upon Mr. Clay as the man certain of obtaining it. This was believed up to the very receipt of the intelligence, that another had been nominated. The news came upon the South with alarming force—for a time it paralyzed the stoutest of the wings—they knew not what to do. They were in breathless anxiety to hear from their delegates why and for what reasons they had gone counter to their expectations. The delegates returned—but without any public address, setting forth the reasons for their conduct—all was doubt and dismay. The party underwent a sort of paralysis. None ever heard it questioned before, that Gen. Garrison was a Federalist, a Bank, Tariff and Internal Improvement man, and withal an Abolitionist, having been placed by the Northern Federalists on the same ticket with Granger of N. York, an admitted one. They knew not what to do—but their managers went to work with the Vincennes Speech and private letters not intended for the “public eye,” with the cry of old soldier, log cabins, hard cider, &c., and have managed, by a series of the most miserable humbugs that ever disgraced any country since the foundation of the world, to impose this obnoxious man on a large majority of their followers.

Against his own declarations, acts and votes—against the fact that he was supported at the last election by the Tariff men, the Bank men, the Improvement men, and the Abolitionists of the North, and all the old-fashioned Federalists throughout the country, his leaders roundly asserted he was neither—And while this has been going on in the South, he has been upheld at the North for reasons directly opposite to those which his friends employ in his behalf here—thus vindicating the wisdom of the Harrisburg Convention in the declaration made by that body, that the views and principles of the great Whig party were too well known to require publication; and also the policy prescribed by Garrison’s committee, that he make no farther declarations for the “public eye.” In fact, the Harrisburg Convention determined their candidate should have two sets of opinions—one for the South and another for the North. That our readers may the more readily see and contrast these opinions, we have subjoined them with the evidence in parallel columns. The late letters of Messrs. Lyons and Calhoun will facilitate our labors:

OPINIONS FOR THE NORTH. OPINIONS FOR THE SOUTH.

1ST. ON FEDERALISM. 1ST. ON FEDERALISM.
In reply to John Randolph in Sept. 16, 1828, to the Editor of 1826, who made the charge a the Inquisitor, General Garrison against General Garrison, that he said: “I deem myself a Republican of what is called the old Jeffersonian School, and believe in the correctness of that interpretation of the Constitution which has been given by the writings of Mr. Adams, I was a Federalist, and he comes to that conclusion from the course pursued by me in 1799. The gentleman had no means of knowing my political principles, unless he obtained them in private conversation. As I was on terms of intimacy with him, it is very probable, that he might have heard me express sentiments favorable to the then Administration.”

(John Adams, Harrison supported John Adams’s Standing Army. He said:

“He had experienced seven years service with the militia, but was sorry to say, such was their conduct, that he never could think of trusting the country entirely to their protection.”
He was appointed Governor of Indiana, by John Adams.
(This makes him acceptable to Federalists who glory in the name.)

2D. ON A BANK.

“Mr. Sherwood Williams: Will you sign and approve (if it be given to the Bank of the U. States come necessary to secure and was unconstitutional—it being save from depreciation the revenue and finances of the nation, and to afford a uniform sound granted powers into effect, and currency to the people of the U. whilst my votes in Congress will states) a bill with proper modifications and restrictions?” constitutional means to revoke the charting of the Bank of the U. States?—Gen. Garrison: “I would, if it will equally show that I am upon the side of those which are in public interest, in relation to thestitutional or violent, and which collection and disbursement of the revenue, would materially suffer without one, and there were unequivocal manifestations of public opinion in its favor.”

2D. ON A BANK.

“I believe that the charter given to the Bank of the U. States was unconstitutional—it being not one of those measures necessary to carry any of the excessive powers into effect, and to afford a uniform sound granted powers into effect, and currency to the people of the U. whilst my votes in Congress will states) a bill with proper modifications and restrictions?” constitutional means to revoke the charting of the Bank of the U. States?—Gen. Garrison: “I would, if it will equally show that I am upon the side of those which are in

I became a member of an ABO CAN, WITHOUT ASSUMPTION OF LUTION SOCIETY, establish POWER, AND THE VIOLATION OF A WHICH WAS TO ANNIHILATE THE COM. TO REMOVE IT, WITHOUT THE DITION OF SLAVES, AND PRECISE CONSENT OF THOSE WHO ARE IN THEIR FREEDOM, BY EVERY LEGAL IMMEDIATELY INTERESTED.”
My venerable friend, every movement which is Judge Gatch, of Claremont conn. made by the Abolitionists in the city, was also a member of this non-slaveholding States, is viewed by me as a certificate that I was an attack upon their rights, and The obligations which I then which, if persisted in, must in the case under I have faithfully performed, to end eradicate those feelings of alienation and affection between

“WM. HENRY HARRISON.” the citizens of all the States,

“Whereas, the existence of which was produced by a conspiracy in our country has ever been of interests and dangers been deemed a great moral and in the war of the Revolution, political evil, and in its tendency which was the foundation of our directly calculated to impair our happy Union, and by a continual character and material sense of which, it can alone be affected our national happiness preserved. I entreat you, then, to affect as much as the extension drawn upon the measures which of a slave population in the U. are to produce results so much to S. is fraught with the most fearful to be deprecated.”—Gen. Garrison’s consequences to the permanency Speech in Indiana, (a free State.) and durability of our Republican “I am convinced that upon re-institutions, and wherens, the election you will yourself think subject of the admission of slave that it was totally unnecessary, in the new State of Missouri, for I cannot suppose, that my party is at this time before the Constitutional friends and connexions in gress of the U. States: There my native State, could think that I was less of a gentleman or an

“Resolved, That our Senators honest man than those ardent and Representatives he request citizens further South, Stanly, and to use their utmost exertions, Alford, Legare, Dawson, King, and take every means, to pre &c., &c. They take it for granted the extension of slavery ed, that I could not suffer my within the Territory of the U. Vincennes speech, and others, to be quoted by my friends to show pl, and the new States to be formed my opinions on the subject of within that Territory, which Abolitionism, if I did not hold the Constitution and the treaties those opinions at this time—they made under it will allow. I have therefore treated with scorn

“Should I be asked if there is any contempt the charge of my way by which the General being an Abolitionist, and truly Government can aid the cause of assert I have done and suffered emancipation, I answer, that it more to support Southern Rights has long been an object near my than any other person North of heart to see the whole of this sh—Mason and Dixon’s line. plus revenue appropriated to that.”—I answer the Inquiry, why I object. With the sanction of the used the word “Abolition” in States holding the slaves, there signifying a society of which I was appears to me to be no constitution—number in Richmond, in the al objection, to its being thus, ap. year 1791, instead of the word plied, embracing not only the col. “Humane,” which is known to be onization of those that may be the one by which the society was otherwise freed, but the purchase really distinguished. All that I of the freedom of others. By a can say upon the subject is, that persons prosecution of a plan if I did really term it an Abolition formed upon that basis, we might society—a fact which I can still look forward to a day not very far off to see the paper containing my address to the people sun would not look down upon a of this District in 1822,) it must have been from forgetfulness;

“Washington, Feb. 4, 1840, Sir: I observed in the doing which might easily happen, after of the Anti-slavery Convention a lapse of 31 years. At any rate, at Springfield, a resolution de—the word Abolition was not un-nouncing Gen. Garrison. I think de-stroyed to mean in 1822, what it this premature, to say the least of now means. There can be no it. I have seen a letter from the doubt, that the society of which General, in which he pronounces Mr. Tarlton Pleasant was a story circulating in the press member, and which, in his public or West (not certain which,) that cation in the Richmond Whig, he, while Governor of Indiana, he calls the “Humane Society of for 10 years did every thing in his Richmond,” (and by this title, power to spread slavery, a foul Judge Gauch, who gave me the slander, and speaks of it with certitude in 1822, also designates great indignation, and says, that it,) was the same of which I was it would be impossible for him to be a member. Mr. Pleasant was a do any thing of the kind, either member in 1791, I in 1791. Mr. privately or publicly, for the rea. Robert Pleasant was the Presi- son, he says, that while only dent at the former period, as he eighteen years of age, in Virg. was when I was admitted.

“Sir: I have seen a letter from the above to be published, but I have power to effect the emancipation of slaves—that he was to inherit a large property in slaves, me as having furnished them.”
(Lyons Letter.)

“Wm. B. CALHOUN.”

“Hon. Judge Morris.”
“You will have seen by the last Philanthropist, that General Garrison is actually a member of an Abolitionist society, and in 1822 claimed not to be in favor of slavery at all, and excused himself for his vote on the Missouri and Arkansas questions, on the ground of constitutional objections, which, consistently with his oath to support the Constitution, he thought he could not disregard. He also claims that he was the first member of Congress to propose the prohibition of slavery forever in the Territory above Missouri. He says, that while he has liberated many slaves, he has never placed one in bondage.”—S. M. Gates, M. C. of N. Y.

5TH. ON ABOLITION.

“The measures of the Emancipation. “General Garrison, like a great endeavored to explain to you the many others, declared himself in principles upon which the Gov. favor of the Proclamation, with verment of our Union informed, out proper consideration and ex-I recommend to you, however, animating (no great compliment) the Proclamation of the President—that since that time he has re-of the United States, issued on called that opinion, and declared the 10th of December last, and himself affably opposed to it.”
Speeches of Mr. Webster, deliv. W. Weston, Whig Elector North- at their last session of Congress, era Neck District. But, now does he know? By what authority does he say all?

3D. ON A TARIFF.

Before the Hamilton County Agricultural Society:—“It is asked whether, under any circumstances, I would be willing advocating the Tariff at great to abandon the Tariff. I answer, length, “I believe, that not one without any hesitation, in the af- of the evils, which were pre-figurative. Whenever the streets dicted from the Tariff, have been covered with grass, and our advantages, which were promised, Southern friends find no market from it, but have been realized for their produce, and this state—and nothing but the folly of things can be distinctly traced abandoning it can bring us back to the Tariff. I would then in to the hard times through which stantly give my voice for its we have passed.” Voted against steadily, or entire repeal, even reducing the tariff on coffee, al- if I should still think that its most a necessary of life to the tinman would be beneficial to to February 14, 1828, from a majority of the American Peo- 5 to 3 cents per pound.—Voted pl. against reduction on tea, Feb. 12, 1827.—Voted for high Tariff were a warm advocate of the protective system, and still believe in the benefits it has conferred upon the country, but I would not disturb the compromise Bill.”

3D. ON A TARIFF.

“Letter to Dr. Taylor, &c., Nov. 2, 1826.

4TH. INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.

In State of Ohio:—

“Resolved, That in the present state of pecuniary embarrassment amongst the people, it is unsafe and impolitic for the Government to pay off the public debt more rapidly than the obligations may have come under to its creditors may require; and that any surplus in the Treasury would be more usefully employed in the internal improvement of the country by upon the Tariff, is sustained by roads and canals, and in the sup.-private letters written to his port and encouragement of domestic manufacture, which motion the South, to be shown to such as to agree was decided in the affirmative.”

(Gen. Garrison voting in the affirmative.)

“Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to use their exertions to procure the passage of laws, embracing the principles recommended in the foregoing resolutions.”

Voted, “That Congress has

power under the Constitution, to appropriate money for the construction of post roads, military and other roads, and of canals, and for the improvement of water courses”—ayes 91, nays 75.—*Harrison among the former.*

“2d. Resolution,” That Congress

has power under the Constitu-

tion, to construct roads and

military roads, provided that

private property be not taken for

public use, without just com-

pensation”—22 yeas, 24 nays—*Harrison among the yeas.*

“3d. Resolution,” That Congress

has power, under the Constitu-

tion, to construct roads and

canals necessary for commerce be-

tween the States, provided that

private property be not taken for

public purposes, without just com-

pensation”—ayes 71, nays 95.—*Harrison among the yeas.*

“4th. Resolution,” That Congress

has power, under the Constitu-

tion, to construct canals for mi-

litary purposes, provided that no

private property be taken for any

such purposes, without just com-

pensation being made therefor”—ayes 61, nays 83—*Harrison among the former.*

Voted subscription to Dismal

Swamp Canal, and afterwards to

other wild projects of internal

improvements; May 15, 1828—*(Senate Journal, page 345.)*

Voted for subscription to stock

in Columbus and Sandusky turn-

pike; February 17, 1827.

Voted against any restriction

on surveys for roads, canals, &c.;

April 9, 1828—*(Senate Journal,* page 298.)

“5TH. ON ABOLITION.

“To the Public.

“The measures of the Emancipation. “Fellow-Citizens: Being call-patrons are weak, presumptuous and ed suddenly home to attend my *inauguration*. What but the sick family, I have but a moderate extremity of weakness and folly to answer a few columbines could induce any one to think which are in circulation concerning would be listened to by a people

“I am accused of being friend-so intelligent as the Southernity to slavery. From my earliest State!”
youth to the present moment I “NEITHER THE STATES WHERE have been the ardent friend of SLAVERY DOES NOT EXIST NOR human liberty. At the age of 18, THE GOVERNMENT OF THE U. S.,

6TH. ON PROCLAMATION.

“I have thus, fellow-citizens, General Garrison, like a great endeavored to explain to you the many others, declared himself in principles upon which the Gov. favor of the Proclamation, with verment of our Union informed, out proper consideration and ex-I recommend to you, however, animating (no great compliment) the Proclamation of the President—that since that time he has re-of the United States, issued on called that opinion, and declared the 10th of December last, and himself affably opposed to it.”
Speeches of Mr. Webster, deliv. W. Weston, Whig Elector North- at their last session of Congress, era Neck District. But, now does he know? By what authority does he say all?

Mr. Calhoun, as containing the most eloquent and satisfactory expositions of those principles that have recently been published.—By issuing that Proclamation, I think Gen. Jackson has rendered a service to his country of greater magnitude than his splendid victory at New Orleans.¹¹

[Cheat Sheet, July 4, 1833.]
(After the subject of the Proclamation had been canvassed and discussed by the People and Legislatures seven months.)

Will the South support Harrison now? That's the question. Has he not two sets of opinions, one for the North and another for the South? We will hold up this Janus-faced, black and white candidate to the people. Let every farmer, mechanic and laborer cut out this article, and keep it in his pocket for the cider drinkers—let them make it their text-book. Tell them what sort of candidate they have; and if they deny what you say, pull it out upon 'em. They'll cry out log cabins and hard cider, coon skins and bald eagles, "Old Tip" and \$4 brands; but keep 'em to it; don't let 'em escape. Make them tell what the principles of their candidate are. They'll be sure to say to you, "come take a drink;" but never mind that—make them "toe the mark" and tell, or give it up, and drink afterwards, if thirsty or inclined to do so. But of one thing you may rest assured, Old Harrison has two sets of principles.

Skies Bright!

The great forte of the Whigs has been boasting and bragging. It is a part of their stock in trade. They boasted of anticipated victories in '32—in '36—and they are bragging in high style now. The last Salem Gazette has hunted up an "amusing reminiscence," being the proceedings of the great Whig Convention at Worcester in 1832, "embracing an Address to the People, and the famous eye-water speech of Mr. Sunday Orator Webster." We shall treat our readers with this precious relic hereafter—Meantime it is sufficient to state, that Mr. President Sulphur and his assistants in the Convention elected Mr. Clay, all hollow; "considering it certain," (as they then said, that Mr. Clay would get 164, and probably 194 votes, out of 288—and lo! instead of Gen. Jackson having only 94 electoral votes, he received 219!) Instead of Clay's having 194, he only got 49! The Whigs are now only boasting in a similar vein, and we should not be much surprised, if they came out with similar success in November next.

Our friends in Virginia are buoyant, ardent and confident of success. All the authentic accounts which we receive (and all the Correspondence of the Central Committee too passes through our hands,) is of that character. In addition to the other items we have published, our friends assure us, that in Henry, Harrison will get a smaller vote than the Whig did in the Spring—that if Stockton had come out in due time in the Spring, he would have been elected in Fayette and Nicholas—that in Pittsylvania, Harrison will not get a majority of 150, though the Oppositionists had a majority of 319 in the Spring. Even in Bedford, our friends are ardent, and look for better times. The Wheeling Argus gives a stirring letter from Tyler county, which says, "Van Buren will get a larger vote here than Steenrod did. In some neighborhoods where Stephenson got a majority, Harrison will scarcely get a vote. Mark what I now say, that Van Buren will get a majority of not less than 170 of the votes of Tyler county."

But our accounts are equally bright from other States. Our friends at Washington are sanguine. Pennsylvania is safe—the Chicago Democrat says, Illinois is safe—Tennessee is safe.—The following is from Georgia:

Extract of a letter from Augusta, Georgia, June 19.
"I take pleasure in assuring you that Van Buren is perfectly safe in Georgia. The old States Right Party, are completely divided, some supporting General Harrison and some Van Buren, while the Union party are almost unanimous in support of the latter. I think the matter now beyond all dispute, and our party gaining ground daily. All the people want is light and truth, and they will act correctly. Democracy must triumph and Federalism trampled in the dust."

Of New York and Ohio, our friends at Washington scarcely entertain doubt. Even in Kentucky, the Feds. are shivering in the wind. Let the Whigs brag; they will be beaten.

Extract from a letter from one of the most respectable gentlemen of Montgomery county, its date 15th.

"There is a great excitement amongst the people with regard to the Presidential election. I think a great REACTION is taking place in this county, and Van Buren will get a LARGE MAJORITY, although Preston got the vote in the Spring."

Additional.—A letter from Louisville, of the 18th, says, "We are in fine spirits, and will give a good account of Old Kentucky in the great trial in November."

A letter from one of the most respectable citizens of Philadelphia received by yesterday's mail, says, "Do not fear for Pennsylvania. The party is united, and will move as one man in October. Sanguine calculates for a majority of from 15 to 30,000. My own careful estimate says, not less than 9,000."

More Developments.—One of the most remarkable productions of these eventful times is an article in the Boston Morning Post of Wednesday last, headed "HARRISON'S SECRET PLEDGES OF ABOLITION—BOTH sides. Mr. William B. Calhoun, and his Issues with the South." It treats the whole subject with great ingenu-

ity and force. Among other startling developments, it sketches the Debate in the late Abolition Convention of Massachusetts. Among other Speakers, was Leavitt, Editor of the Emancipator at New York. He charged Gen. Harrison with the "double process of concealment." He said he "knew the fact that Harrison, since his recent nomination, and before, had gained much of their favor and confidence, in his personal intercourse with the Abolitionists of Cincinnati"—and L. added that "Mr. Gates of N. Y. (a Whig Abolition member of Congress) had written a letter which he (Leavitt) had seen, affirming from facts within his knowledge, that Harrison had changed his opinions on Abolition, since his speech at Vincennes, and his Cheviot oration, which is quoted by Mr. Rives, in his letter to the Virginians, to prove Harrison's pro-slavery."—Strange mysteries these!

The following is an extract from the Louisville Advertiser, of the 17th instant, (received by yesterday's mail.)

"Tremblings in the Camp.—A much-respected fellow citizen has allowed us to transcribe from a letter of business the following postscript:—

"You ask my sentiments in regard to the candidates for the Presidency. You know I have been hitherto opposed to the Administration; and, if a proper Whig candidate were now before the people, although I have much distrust of the honesty of the present Whig leaders, I am not quite certain how I should act. But, viewing the present contest as an unavoidable choice between Harrison and Van Buren, I cannot hesitate a moment in giving the preference to the latter. Harrison's attitude, it is secretly admitted by his adherents here, is that of studied deception and Janus-faced equivocation. The conduct of his adherents is that of a band of hungry wolves, eager for the spoils of office, and reckless of the consequences of their plunder. It is perfectly evident to all, that if they could seize on the Government at this stage of their madness, the mischief they would do, could not be even estimated. On the other hand, people are cooling down to the conviction that Martin Van Buren's attitude before the people is that of manliness and firm reliance on the justness of his principles, and the avowed course of action he promises, leaving no room for doubt or insincerity.

"I do not see how any can be so blind as to think Harrison can be elected. You may rely upon it that it is wholly uncertain he can get Ohio. I am positive he could not get the city of Cincinnati this day, at two o'clock, so strong is the tide setting against him. In my late excursion through various counties of Virginia, I found a large majority of influential men so decidedly opposed to him—many of them Whigs, too—that I could not resist the conviction that it will be impossible for him, in his present attitude, to get a slave State. Part of Kentucky, particularly about Lexington, is strongly relied on by his friends, though it is manifest they begin to tremble for the result in the whole State. New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, &c., he now despairs of. On the whole, I have made up my mind to go for Van Buren this time, in preference to Harrison, let what will happen."

CIRCULAR.

To the County Corresponding Committees, &c.

RICHMOND, June 19, 1840.

Gentlemen: A thorough organization of the Democracy of Virginia, and the concentration of its energies, are as essential at this eventful crisis, that we feel impelled to invoke your co-operation in their accomplishment. The dissemination of truth, and the diffusion of principles which have stood the test of reason, and have been found to be the only solid bases of Republican Institutions—the correction of error, and the exposure of falsehood and deception, are objects worthy of your most active exertions. The disgusting scenes that are acting throughout this Confederacy, evincing on the part of the Federal managers the most profound contempt for the intelligence of the people—the revival of exploded heresies—the denial of established rights—the assaults upon principles long cherished—and the defiance of Laws and Constitutions, are enough to rouse every Democrat, and arm him for the contest. Warned by the gathering of the clans—by the preparation for battle—by the shouts of anticipated victory, and by the camp fires that are blazing around us, we will not wait till "the Philistines be upon us," but every man, with a vigilance that never sleeps, must feel as if he is the sentinel upon whom the destiny of the Republic rests. With this spirit, we shall be inspired with a fervor and zeal that will defy every effort of our opponents. We would recommend to you, therefore, forthwith, one and all, to call a Convention in each Electoral District of the State—invite an early meeting of the people in your county, for the purpose of selecting Delegates to such Conventions—send forth your most influential and distinguished citizens—let them consult together and devise the means necessary to produce harmony of action; impress every one with the necessity of discarding personal considerations and paltry differences of opinion, and, standing shoulder to shoulder, without wavering or faltering, let us nobly battle for rights and

principles. Let no man remain at home, because he is in a minority in his county. At the approaching Election every vote will count in the aggregate, and no man can vote but once. Every flake will assist to swell the avalanche that will discomfit and overwhelm the opposition. Virginia calls for a levy *en masse*; and confidently expects every man to do his duty. Nor should any man remain at home, because he is in a large majority in his county. Virginia relies mainly upon her strongholds, and calculates that each county, nobly vying with the other, will put forth its whole strength. She confidently expects that every Republican in the Commonwealth will act, as if the fate of his country depended solely on his single vote and upon his individual exertions. With such a spirit the Democracy will be invincible.

We would recommend to these Conventions to adopt resolutions expressive of their opinions on the Presidential Election, and of the necessity imposed upon the Democratic Party to meet the crisis, and to use every honourable exertion to prevent the restoration of Federal principles. By the experience taught us in times past of the misrule of Federal administrations—by their departures from every principle that we have been taught by our ancestors to revere—and by every consideration that actuated the fathers of the orthodox faith in waging an uncompromising hostility to the opinions and doctrines promulgated in the reign of terror, we are stimulated to oppose and resist them; and if the people have not departed from the true faith, we shall obtain a glorious triumph.

We recommend to the County Meetings to invite the Elector nominated by the State Convention for their district, the Democratic members of Congress, and all the Democratic citizens of the district, who can do so, to attend the District Conventions—We suggest the propriety of inviting men of sterling integrity and talents to deliver public addresses to the people—to disabuse their minds of the deceptions that have been practised, and to scout, expose and ridicule the humbugs of the day.

And, finally, we would unite with the Democratic Association of Richmond in recommending the assembling of a State Convention at Charlottesville on the 9th day of September next. We cannot but believe that such a Convention, coming from every part of the State, collecting information from every source, and maintaining and vindicating our common principles, if cordially sustained by the Democracy, will rouse the People to a sense of their danger, and cause them to rally, to rescue the Constitution from the bold and violent assaults with which it is threatened.

The time for the Presidential Election is now rapidly approaching, and it behoves every son of Virginia, who ardently desires the promotion of sound Democratic principles, to redouble his vigilance, and to annihilate now and forever every vestige of Federalism.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS RITCHIE,
Secretary of the Dem. Central Committee of Va.

Items of News.

The Great Western arrived at New York on the 19th, with London dates to the 4th. A small decline in cotton. The crops promising in England.—Preparations are making to bring the remains of Napoleon from St. Helena to France, to be interred with the most imposing honors.—Mr. Benjamin Rush has brought dispatches from Mr. Stevenson, which are said to open a prospect of an amicable adjustment of the Boundary Question.

Mexico.—The Federal or Revolutionary party has taken the city of Campeachy, and now threaten Tampico and Vera Cruz.—An arrival at New Orleans reports, that "Mr. Packham, the British Minister, has been treating with the President of Mexico for the cession of Yucatan; and Bustamante, it is supposed, will agree to sell what he has now no hopes of recovering."

Congress.—The Proceedings of Lieut. Hooe's trial have been submitted to the II. of R. by the Secretary of the Navy, with a defence of the Secretary, of his course in approving the sentence, together with a legal opinion of the U. S. District Attorney, Francis S. Key. Mr. Thompson of Mississippi moved to refer the whole communication to the Judiciary Committee (no doubt with a view of providing some rule about the evidence of negroes before the Federal tribunals.) This subject was not disposed of on Wednesday. Messrs. Allen of Ohio and Sergeant spoke against the Independent Treasury Bill. (It is expected, that the bill will pass early next week, without amendment.)

Senate.—The Bankrupt bill was ordered to be engrossed on Wednesday, by a vote of 24 to 23. The two most important amendments made in it on that day, were a provision offered by Mr. Wall, making it obligatory on the bankrupt to serve a personal notice on his creditors; and fixing the period of the commencement of the operations of the act on the 1st of February next. It was expected to pass, by the casting vote of the Vice President.

Wm. B. Dabney, (late First Teller of the Bank of Virginia,) has been examined before the Mayor of this city and committed to jail.

